

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Leg.]

#### YEAS—61

Abraham	Gorton	McConnell
Ashcroft	Gramm	Murkowski
Bennett	Grams	Nickles
Bond	Grassley	Nunn
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Pryor
Bryan	Hatfield	Reid
Bumpers	Heflin	Roth
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Byrd	Hollings	Shelby
Chafee	Hutchison	Simpson
Coats	Inhofe	Smith
Cohen	Jeffords	Snowe
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Specter
Craig	Kempthorne	Stevens
D'Amato	Kyl	Thomas
DeWine	Lieberman	Thompson
Domenici	Lott	Thurmond
Faircloth	Lugar	Warner
Frahm	Mack	
Frist	McCain	

#### NAYS—38

Akaka	Feinstein	Levin
Baucus	Ford	Mikulski
Biden	Glenn	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Graham	Moynihan
Boxer	Harkin	Murray
Bradley	Inouye	Pell
Campbell	Johnston	Robb
Conrad	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Daschle	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Dodd	Kerry	Simon
Dorgan	Kohl	Wellstone
Exon	Lautenberg	Wyden
Feingold	Leahy	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

The amendment (No. 4438) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate bill is considered read a third time, and the House bill, H.R. 743, is discharged from the Committee on Labor and Human Resources. The clerk will report the House bill.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 743) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all after the enacting clause of H.R. 743 is stricken, the text of the S. 295, as amended, is inserted in lieu thereof, and the bill is considered read a third time.

The question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 743, as amended, pass? A rollcall vote has not yet been requested.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 191 Leg.]

#### YEAS—53

Abraham	Gramm	McConnell
Ashcroft	Grams	Murkowski
Bennett	Grassley	Nickles
Bond	Gregg	Nunn
Brown	Hatch	Pressler
Burns	Hatfield	Roth
Chafee	Helms	Santorum
Coats	Hollings	Shelby
Cohen	Hutchison	Simpson
Coverdell	Inhofe	Smith
Craig	Jeffords	Snowe
D'Amato	Kassebaum	Specter
DeWine	Kempthorne	Stevens
Domenici	Kyl	Thomas
Faircloth	Lott	Thompson
Frahm	Lugar	Thurmond
Frist	Mack	Warner
Gorton	McCain	

#### NAYS—46

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Biden	Ford	Moseley-Braun
Bingaman	Glenn	Moynihan
Boxer	Graham	Murray
Bradley	Harkin	Pell
Breaux	Heflin	Pryor
Bryan	Inouye	Reid
Bumpers	Johnston	Robb
Byrd	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Campbell	Kerrey	Sarbanes
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Daschle	Kohl	Wellstone
Dodd	Lautenberg	Wyden
Dorgan	Leahy	
Exon	Levin	

#### NOT VOTING—1

Cochran

The bill (H.R. 743), as amended, was passed, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 743) entitled "An Act to amend the National Labor Relations Act to allow labor management cooperative efforts that improve economic competitiveness in the United States to continue to thrive, and for other purposes.", do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Teamwork for Employees and Managers Act of 1995".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the escalating demands of global competition have compelled an increasing number of employers in the United States to make dramatic changes in workplace and employer-employee relationships;

(2) such changes involve an enhanced role for the employee in workplace decisionmaking, often referred to as "Employee Involvement", which has taken many forms, including self-managed work teams, quality-of-worklife, quality circles, and joint labor-management committees;

(3) Employee Involvement programs, which operate successfully in both unionized and

nonunionized settings, have been established by over 80 percent of the largest employers in the United States and exist in an estimated 30,000 workplaces;

(4) in addition to enhancing the productivity and competitiveness of businesses in the United States, Employee Involvement programs have had a positive impact on the lives of such employees, better enabling them to reach their potential in the workforce;

(5) recognizing that foreign competitors have successfully utilized Employee Involvement techniques, the Congress has consistently joined business, labor and academic leaders in encouraging and recognizing successful Employee Involvement programs in the workplace through such incentives as the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award;

(6) employers who have instituted legitimate Employee Involvement programs have not done so to interfere with the collective bargaining rights guaranteed by the labor laws, as was the case in the 1930's when employers established deceptive sham "company unions" to avoid unionization; and

(7) Employee Involvement is currently threatened by legal interpretations of the prohibition against employer-dominated "company unions".

(b) PURPOSES.—The purpose of this Act is—

(1) to protect legitimate Employee Involvement programs against government interference;

(2) to preserve existing protections against deceptive, coercive employer practices; and

(3) to allow legitimate Employee Involvement programs, in which workers may discuss issues involving terms and conditions of employment, to continue to evolve and proliferate.

#### SEC. 3. EMPLOYER EXCEPTION.

Section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act is amended by striking the semicolon and inserting the following: " ". Provided further, That it shall not constitute or be evidence of an unfair labor practice under this paragraph for an employer to establish, assist, maintain, or participate in any organization or entity of any kind, in which employees who participate to at least the same extent practicable as representatives of management participate, to address matters of mutual interest, including, but not limited to, issues of quality, productivity, efficiency, and safety and health, and which does not have, claim, or seek authority to be the exclusive bargaining representative of the employees or to negotiate or enter into collective bargaining agreements with the employer or to amend existing collective bargaining agreements between the employer and any labor organization, except that in a case in which a labor organization is the representative of such employees as provided in section 9(a), this proviso shall not apply;".

#### SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON EFFECT OF ACT.

Nothing in this Act shall affect employee rights and responsibilities contained in provisions other than section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. FORD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the previously ordered morning business period, that Senator DASCHLE

or his designee be in control of the first 40 minutes and that Senator THOMAS or his designee be in control of the remaining 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we had asked for some time today to discuss the agenda that we have developed over recent months, to talk about what we think we ought to be doing and where we think this country ought to be heading. I am going to speak for a few minutes. My colleague, Senator REID from Nevada, will address a number of the topics, and our colleague, Senator BOXER from California, will address a number of them. We will similarly have a discussion tomorrow about the same issues.

The reason we wanted to do this, it is easy to be against things. It does not take any skill or any great intelligence to be opposed to things. I think it was Mark Twain who once, when asked if he would participate in a debate, said, "Fine, provided that I can be on the opposing side." They said, "Why?" And he said, "That will take no preparation."

It takes no skill, time, or preparation to oppose. Those who oppose can do it immediately and quickly without much thought.

The question is not what are we opposed to. The question in Congress is, what do we stand for? Why are we here? What are we doing? What do we want for this country?

I begin by saying, in the end and in the final analysis, the question of whether we are on the right track in this country, whether we are headed in the right direction, is not measured by any myriad of statistics put out by the Federal Reserve Board or the Treasury Department or the Census Bureau or any organization in this town or elsewhere; it is, finally, measured when people sit down at the supper table at home at night and ask themselves, how are we doing? Is our standard of living improving? Are we moving ahead? Are we able to find good jobs, keep good jobs? Are our children able to find good jobs? Are we secure? Is there crime in the street that threatens us? Do our kids have an opportunity to go to good schools? Are our roads in good shape?

A whole range of questions like that relate to the determination of whether individual families are doing better. In shorthand, the way of saying it is, if at the end of the day the standard of liv-

ing in this country is not increasing, then we are not moving in the right direction. The question is, what kind of choices, what menu of opportunities exist for us to make decisions in this country in both the private sector and the public sector that increase the standard of living, keep us moving forward?

As a society, if you read the history of our country, you will discover that we have always had a circumstance where, generally speaking, parents believed things work better for their children and they were willing to do things to make life better for their children—investing in schools, for example, so that we would have the best education in the world. Those are the kinds of things that created a circumstance where our economy has been a remarkable economy, producing jobs and opportunities, so that standards of living increased in our country routinely and regularly.

We have now reached a period where we are more challenged in those areas. We now have what is called a global economy in which 2 or 3 billion workers around the world now compete with about two-thirds of the American work force, and many of those other people around the world work for very low wages. It is not unusual to hear the stories of 10-year-olds, 12-year-olds, 20- or 40-year-olds working for 10 cents an hour, 20 cents an hour or \$1 an hour, for 10 hours or 15 hours a day in other parts of world. The product of that work shows up in Pittsburgh or Denver or New York or Fargo, to be sold on the shelf and purchased by the American consumer.

It all relates to this question: Are we doing the things necessary in the public sector and the private sector to improve life in America and to increase the standard of living in our country?

About a year ago, Senator DASCHLE, the minority leader, asked Senator REID and myself to engage in an effort with other members of our caucus, a fairly substantial group of the Democratic caucus, to put together an analysis of what is it that represents our positive agenda, what kind of things do we want to see accomplished in Congress, what kind of ideas exist that we think will improve life in America. We held meeting after meeting and tried to get the best ideas that existed among those from the Democratic side of the aisle here in Congress in order to develop an agenda. The Senator from Nevada was very active in that with me, and the Senator from California, Senator BOXER was very active. We developed an agenda and worked with the Democratic caucus on that agenda.

Following that, we took that as a starting point and then worked with the members of the Democratic caucus in the House of Representatives and with President Clinton and others and synthesized this and developed this into a fairly common agenda that says: Here is what we are for, here is why we are here, here is what we want to have

happen that we think will improve life in America.

Let me give you some examples. The agenda talks about "families first." This is families first. I talk about it in the context of jobs, kids, and values. That is what people who sit around the dinner table talk about. What kind of jobs do we have? What kind of opportunity do we have? What kind of security do we have? What about our kids; how are the schools? What about crime? What about values? What are they seeing on television? A whole series of issues surrounding families, American families.

We talk about it in the context of responsibility and security. First, we say we believe that we ought to have a balanced Federal budget. We believe it is possible, we believe it is achievable, and we believe it ought to be done. It ought to be done the right way.

There are some who would balance the budget with all the wrong priorities. Last year I spoke at length about those who would say, "Let us cut the Star Schools Program by 40 percent and increase the star wars program by 100 percent."

Now, that is a wrongheaded approach, but we should balance the Federal budget. The era of big government is over. Our agenda does not suggest that Government can, should, or will solve all of the problems of this country. But we can contribute in the right way. So we say we ought to balance the Federal budget. That is part of the democratic agenda.

We ought to help small businesses, medium-sized businesses, and others in this country thrive, survive, and create jobs and compete. There are a series of ways to do that, and we talk about that in the agenda.

We ought to also reinvest in our communities and infrastructure. We ought to make sure that the basic things that deal with everyday life—roads, bridges, rail systems, and others—are up to date and are not decaying.

Then we talk about individual responsibility and a welfare system that works. We call it work first. That is what we stand for—work first. We say, especially in this proposal for welfare, that we ought to get tough with deadbeat parents. Why on earth should other taxpayers be stuck paying tens of billions of dollars that is owed especially by fathers who have left their families and decided they are not going to pay a cent for the welfare of their children, so those deadbeats say to the rest of the taxpayers, "You pick up the tab of something I will not pay for," which is basic care for their children. We say that has to stop. That is part of welfare reform as well.

A national crusade to end this burgeoning teenage pregnancy in this country is part of our agenda. That, of course, starts at home, in the home, in the community. But we believe that is an important element of what we ought to be doing to try to improve life in this country.